

Appl. No. 10/656,564
Amdt Dated Oct. 10, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Jul. 28, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-9 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,305,405 to Emmons et al. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Emmons et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,612,780 to Rickenbach et al. Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Emmons et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,764,043 to Czosonwski et al.

In response to this rejection, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 10 and 15 to incorporate to novel limitations thereto.

In rejection of Claim 1, the corresponding elements of the illuminate member and the passage of the instant invention are not explicitly identified by Examiner in Emmons et al. In addition, the element 22 in Emmons et al. is referred to as an optical fiber. But in rejection of Claim 2, the element 22 is referred to as an illuminating member. It is vague what the element 22 is really referred to as, since either of the optical fiber and the illuminating member is an individual element in the instant invention. According to 37 C.F.R. 1.104(c), "[t]he pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified".

Claim 1 is amended to add all of the limitations of Claim 2. In the instant invention, at least a first of the two connectors defines a passage and terminates a **first end of the optical fiber opposite to the passage**. Each of the two connectors (31) comprises an illuminating member (34), and **said passage (335) is defined in each illuminating member (34)**.

Appl. No. 10/656,564
Amdt Dated Oct. 10, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Jul. 28, 2005

In rejection of Claim 1, it is described that "a first of the two connectors defines a passage and terminates a first end of the optical fiber opposite to the passage (column 6, lines 10-11)"(referring to the office action, page 2, last paragraph, lines 5-7). However, in column 6 lines 10-11 of the specification of Emmons et al., it is described that "in use, **four fibers 110 are received within bores 96**. The fibers 110 are all connected to a common light source 120. ". The bore (96) and the fiber (110 or 22) are apparently different from the passage (335) and the illuminating member (34) of amended Claim 1 of the present invention. The features "**a first end of the optical fiber opposite to the passage**" and "**said passage is defined in each illuminating member**" are not disclosed in Emmons et al.

As stated by the Federal Circuit, "[a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of *each and every* element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the claim*." (Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984)). Emmons et al. neither discloses each and every element of the instant invention, nor discloses the elements arranged as the instant invention. Therefore, amended Claim 1 is patentable over Emmons et al.

Claims 2-9 are canceled.

Regarding Claim 10 of the present invention, all of the limitations of Claim 14 have been added into Claim 10. In amended Claim 10, the connector (31, 33) comprises a transparent housing (330), and the illuminating member (334) is **formed on an outer surface of the transparent housing (330)**.

Appl. No. 10/656,564
Amdt Dated Oct. 10, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Jul. 28, 2005

In rejection of Claim 14, it is described that "Emmons et al disclose a transparent housing (column 4 lines 24-27) and the illuminator is formed on the outer surface of the housing (column 4 lines 61-68)". But in column 4 lines 24-27 and 61-68 of the specification of Emmons et al, it is not disclosed in fact that the fiber (22 or 110) that can be formed on an outer surface of the coupling (24).

Anticipation requires the prior art discloses each and every element of the claimed invention, and arranged as in the claim. Emmons et al. apparently has no such disclosure. Therefore, amended Claim 10 should be allowable.

Claims 11-14 are canceled.

Regarding Claim 15 of the present invention, all of limitations of Claim 16 are added into Claim 15. In amended Claim 15, a passage and an illuminating member are formed in each of the two connectors, and **each illuminating member defines said passage therein.**

But in Emmons et al, in use, **four fibers 110 are received within bores 96** (column 6 lines 10-11). The bore (96) and the fiber (110) are apparently different from the passage (335) and the illuminating member (34) of amended Claim 15 of the present invention, respectively. **And there is no clue and suggestion in Emmons et al for a person having ordinary skill at the time of the invention to develop that the bore (96) can be defined in the fiber (110).** Accordingly, amended Claim 15 should be allowable.

Claims 16-20 are canceled.

In view of the foregoing, the subject application as claimed in the pending claims is in a condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly

Appl. No. 10/656,564
Amdt Dated Oct. 10, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Jul. 28, 2005

solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Angelo et al.

By 

Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325

Foxconn International, Inc.

P. O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (408) 919-6137